

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

United States of America,

Case No. 21-cr-196 (PJS/TNL)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Charles Randall Sorensen,

Defendant.

This matter is before the Court on Defendant Charles Randall Sorensen's Third Motion to Continue Deadlines. (ECF No. 26.) Defendant has also filed a Statement of Facts in Support of Exclusion of Time Under Speedy Trial Act. (ECF No. 27.) Defendant asks to continue "all deadlines for disclosure, motions, hearings, and trial" for approximately two and a half months. (ECF No. 26 at 1.)

Defendant makes this request for a number of reasons specific to this case. Defendant notes that discovery in this case is complex, involving tax and accounting issues and cryptocurrency transactions. (*Id.*) Defendant has submitted these issues to expert witnesses who are currently engaged in the field of tax preparation and have asked for an extension to thoroughly review, investigate, and prepare opinions in this matter. (*Id.*) Given the unique circumstances of this case, the parties have met and conferred and agreed to a lengthier continuance. (*Id.*) This continuance would move the motion filing deadline to August 31, 2022.

Additionally, beginning on March 13, 2020, and continuing thereafter, the Honorable John R. Tunheim, Chief District Judge for the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota, has issued a series of General Orders in connection with the COVID-19 pandemic, addressing, among other things, criminal proceedings and trials.¹ On June 1, 2022, Chief Judge Tunheim entered General Order No. 36, which allows limited in-person proceedings for defendants who decline to consent to conducting the proceeding using videoconferencing, or telephone conferencing if videoconferencing is not reasonably available. *See generally In re: Updated Guidance to Court Operations Under the Exigent Circumstances Created by COVID-19*, Gen. Order No. 36 (D. Minn. June 1, 2022). General Order No. 36 states that because only limited in-person proceedings may be held each day, criminal proceedings may be continued until the date that the criminal proceeding takes place.

General Order No. 36 continues to encourage the use of videoconferencing in criminal proceedings and states that, with the defendant's consent, criminal proceedings will be conducted by videoconferencing, or telephone conferencing if videoconferencing is not reasonably available. General Order No. 36 further provides that the presiding judge will enter orders in individual cases to extend deadlines and exclude time under the Speedy Trial Act to address delays attributable to COVID-19. **Accordingly, should Defendant file pretrial motions, counsel shall also file a letter indicating whether Defendant**

¹ All General Orders related to the COVID-19 pandemic may be found on the Court's website at <https://www.mnd.uscourts.gov/coronavirus-covid-19-guidance>.

consents to a motions hearing by videoconference. (*See also* ECF Nos. 16, 22 at 2, 25 at 3.)

Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h), this Court finds that the ends of justice served by granting a continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and Defendant in a speedy trial and such continuance is necessary to provide Defendant and his counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and to make efficient use of the parties' resources. While this is the third continuance and this length of a continuance is atypical, the Court finds that it is warranted given the unique circumstances in this case. Based on all the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that:

1. Defendant's Third Motion to Continue Deadlines (ECF No. 26) is **GRANTED**.

2. The period of time from **June 14 through September 26, 2022**, shall be excluded from Speedy Trial Act computations in this case.

3. All motions in the above-entitled case shall be filed and served consistent with Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 12(b) and 47 on or before **August 31, 2022**.² D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(1). Two courtesy copies of all motions and responses shall be delivered directly to the chambers of Magistrate Judge Tony N. Leung.³

4. **Counsel shall also file a letter on or before August 31, 2022, indicating whether Defendant consents to a motions hearing by videoconference.**

5. **Counsel shall electronically file a letter on or before August 31, 2022, if**

² "Before filing a motion under Fed. R. Crim. P. 12(b), the moving party must confer with the responding party. The parties must attempt in good faith to clarify and narrow the issues in dispute." D. Minn. LR 12.1(b).

³ U.S. Mail or hand-deliver to 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 9W, Minneapolis, MN 55415.

no motions will be filed and there is no need for a hearing.

6. All responses to motions shall be filed by **September 14, 2022**. D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(2).

7. Any Notice of Intent to Call Witnesses⁴ shall be filed by **September 14, 2022**. D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(3)(A).

8. Any Responsive Notice of Intent to Call Witnesses⁵ shall be filed by **September 19, 2022**. D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(3)(B).

9. A motions hearing will be held pursuant to Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure 12(c) where:

- a. The Government makes timely disclosures and a defendant pleads particularized matters for which an evidentiary hearing is necessary; or
- b. Oral argument is requested by either party in its motion, objection or response pleadings.

10. If required and subject to further order of the Court, the motions hearing shall be heard before Magistrate Judge Tony N. Leung on **September 26, 2022**, at **1:30 p.m.**, in **Courtroom 9W**, Diana E. Murphy U.S. Courthouse, 300 South Fourth Street, **MINNEAPOLIS**, Minnesota 55415. D. Minn. LR 12.1(d).

11. TRIAL: The trial date, and other related dates, will be rescheduled

⁴ “When a party intends to call witnesses at a hearing on a motion under Fed. R. Crim P. 12(b), the party must file a notice within 35 days after the arraignment. The notice must identify the number of witnesses whom the party intends to call, the motion or motions that each witness will be addressing, and the estimated duration of each witness’s testimony.” D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(3)(A).

⁵ “If after reviewing a notice under LR 12(c)(3), a party intends to call witnesses at the same hearing, that party must file a responsive notice within 38 days after the arraignment. The responsive party must identify the number of witnesses whom the party intends to call, the motion or motions each witness will be addressing, and the estimated duration of each witness’s testimony.” D. Minn. LR 12.1(c)(3)(B).

following the ruling on pretrial motions. Counsel must contact the Courtroom Deputy for District Judge Patrick J. Schiltz to confirm the new trial date.

Dated: June 16, 2022

s/Tony N. Leung
TONY N. LEUNG
United States Magistrate Judge
District of Minnesota

United States v. Sorensen
Case No. 21-cr-196 (PJS/TNL)